in Madras and that our rates might be brought into line with Madras rates.

Reply of Government.—The practice in British India will be ascertained and the representation considered.

Subject No. 37.

The abolition of Central Nazir system.

Mr. A Ramanna.

Summary of Discussion.—The present Central Nazir system is a failure as processes are not served in time. The results of this are complicacy in accounts and dissatisfaction among the litigant public owing to unnecessary adjournments or closing of cases without the production of necessary evidence. All the Judges have no hold upon him as he is a subordinate to only one of them. There is a Deputy Nazir in every Court and with the existing establishment of process servers the revival of the old system and the abolition of the office of the Central Nazir will produce better results.

Mr. Ramanna said that rules were all right. But they are not enforced strictly and promotions are not given to deserving men, nor accounts and duty registers properly kept. 15 out of 64 peons are employed on guard and other duty. Then there are left 49, or 10 for each taluk. This number is quite ample if each man serves about 250 instead of 360. But many of these peons are otherwise employed. Only 26 really do serving work. Rotation is not properly carried out. The rules should also be revised in certain respects and strictly enforced before considering the question of the abolition of the system.

Reply of Government.—The subject is under consideration, and any suitable changes needed will be made in the rules.

Subject No. 38.

Attachment of movable properties in connection with decrees from Civil Courts.

Mr. Hedase Devara Sastri of Koppa Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—The amins charged with the execution of Civil Court decrees while attaching movable properties of defendants (Judgment-debtors generally bring with them persons deputed by the plaintiffs and take inventories without sufficient description of properties, with the result that, before sale, they are replaced by inferior articles. Such properties fetch very low prices and cause loss to the defendants. To put a stop to this it is requested that the amins may be required to take the inventories before the patel, the shanbhog and landholders, not less than three in number of the village in which such property is found and affix some distinguishing mark on each of the articles attached, giving at the same time a copy of the inventories to the defendants.

Reply of Government.—The proposal is impracticable unless the amins are empowered to enforce the appearance of the shanbhog and patel and three landholders. Such proceedings will greatly delay execution of decrees. The Chief Court have recently issued a rule of practice for giving an inventory of attached moveables to the judgment